

**DESIGNER SELECTION COMMITTEE REPORT
FOR THE SELECTION OF
DESIGNER SERVICES
UNION STATION REGIONAL INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION CENTER**

Memorandum

To: Springfield Redevelopment Authority Governing Board

From: Union Station Designer Selection Committee

Subject: Selection Committee Report and Recommendation – RFQ #09-20100001

Date: December 3, 2010

The purpose of this memorandum is to provide the Springfield Redevelopment Authority (SRA) Governing Board with the firm rankings and recommendations of the Designer Selection Committee (Committee) in connection with the request for Design Services (RFQ #09-20100001) issued by the SRA on September 23, 2010. That request was issued to obtain design services for the Union Station Regional Intermodal Transportation Center project. The services were procured in accordance with the Designer Selection Law (MGL Chapter 7, §§ 38 A½).

The SRA Governing Board designated a Designer Selection Committee to conduct the process consistent with its Designer Selection Procedures. The DSC consisted of the following individuals:

Guy Bresnahan, Chair of the DSC
Office of Transportation Planning
MassDOT

Armando Feliciano, Chair, Springfield Redevelopment Authority
Springfield Adult Education

Timothy Brennan, Executive Director
Pioneer Valley Planning Commission

Leslie Lawrence, Director of Lending
Western MA Enterprise Fund

Jose Claudio - DevelopSpringfield Board Member
Director of Community Development and Public Relations
New North Citizen's Council

The Designer Selection Committee met over three meetings. All meetings were subject to the open meeting law and were duly posted, and open to the public with minutes taken at each meeting. Copies of the meeting minutes are attached to this memorandum.

On October 22, 2010, the SRA received four proposals in response to RFQ #09-20100001. The firms submitting proposals were:

1. Cambridge Seven Associates, Inc.
2. Finegold Alexander + Associates, Inc.
3. HDR Architecture, Inc.
4. IBI Group

The submittals were screened by the SRA staff to ensure that they met the minimum requirements set forth in the RFQ. Staff determined that all submittals met those requirements and forwarded them to the Committee. Each member of the Designer Selection Committee reviewed, and evaluated the submittals based on the evaluation criteria contained in the RFQ, as noted below:

- Must possess all necessary current licenses and registrations, either within the firm or through independent consultants, to qualify under Massachusetts law to perform the function of the designer of the project within the meaning of M.G.L. Chapter 7, Section 38A½. A Massachusetts registered architect must be responsible for and be in control of the services to be provided pursuant to the contract.
- Must possess knowledge of, and experience in, legal and administrative requirements, procedures, and practices related to the design, funding and construction of Massachusetts public building projects including the State Building Code and Massachusetts public building and procurement law.
- Must have similar experience with projects of comparable scale, complexity and significance, including the technical expertise required to successfully complete the Scope of Work. Specifically, the application should demonstrate:
 - Experience with transit-oriented development projects that complement and enhance the transit system including passenger rail and bus service.
 - Experience with Massachusetts public bid process and public construction laws.
 - Experience integrating mixed-use projects with transit facilities and operations.
 - Experience working with transit/redevelopment authorities and operating effectively in the public arena.
 - Expertise in restoration and reuse of historic buildings.
 - Experience in project permitting at the local, state and federal levels.
 - Experience with sustainable design and the LEED process.
- Must have a track record of successful past performance on similar projects, demonstrating an acceptable level of creativity, innovation, resourcefulness and positive outcome in the following areas:
 - Quality, clarity, completeness and accuracy of design concepts and studies.
 - Effectiveness meeting program requirements and functions within allotted budget.
 - Ability to meet allotted schedule for preparation of design and study documents.
 - Coordination and management of sub-consultants.

- Completion of projects within established budget and schedule.
- Good working relationships with consultants and owners.
- Must show strength and experience of the key personnel who will be dedicated to the assignment.
- Must have the ability to provide the deliverables and complete the assigned tasks in the timeframes provided.
- Must have references confirming the qualifications stated by the firm or firms.
- Must show evidence of the financial stability of the firm.
- Must address current total workload as it affects ability to perform this work, and availability of particular professionals.
- Must have evidence of insurance for general liability, automobile, workers' compensation and professional services liability, as required in Standard Form of Contract.
- Must submit required forms and certifications.

On November 10, 2010, the Committee met and discussed the review of each submittal. The majority of members agreed that the submittal from Finegold Alexander did not meet the level of the other three responses. Members stated that it lacked in its presentation, creativity and had no depth in their analysis of the project. However, one member did not feel that there was adequate information to dismiss FA+A from further consideration. After a lengthy discussion it was voted to dismiss Finegold Alexander, with one abstention.

The members unanimously agreed to interview the remaining three unranked finalists, who were then notified and required to appear for an interview before the Committee on November 19, 2010:

Cambridge Seven Associates, Inc.
IBI Group
HDR Architecture Inc.

In addition, the committee requested that each unranked finalist submit in writing further detail on the percentage of time that each team member would spend on each on the six phases of the scope of services outlined in the RFQ.

Each interview consisted of a 60 minute presentation with a 30 minute follow-up for questions and answers by the Committee.

During the interviews, the unranked finalists were asked a variety of questions, with the primary focus on the following:

- List in order of importance the four main challenges you see in our project, and explain how you would propose to address them?
- How will work be coordinated among team members? What is the team's prior experience working together?
- Who is the most important person on your team and why?
- Why should we choose your team?

Following the interviews on November 19, 2010, the members voted to instruct SRA staff to conduct reference checks and due diligence review on each of the unranked finalists. The process included reference checks provided in the submittal, other public agencies including Division of Capital Asset Management (DCAM) evaluations (as available), and other projects and information from the web.

A report from SRA Counsel, Peter Barry regarding his review of information on the public domain indicated that he found nothing that in his view should cause the Committee to prefer one firm over another.

The DSC took into account all of the information including: quality of team, interviews, and references, information in the submittal, other public/private work, and information obtained from the web.

After lengthy review and discussions, the committee members were individually polled as to their top three finalists. All members were in agreement and a vote ranked the three finalists in the following order:

- 1.HDR Architecture, inc
- 2.IBI Group
- 3.Cambridge Seven Associates, Inc.

The proposed Owner's Project Manager (OPM), Skanska Building USA was present at all of the Committee meetings and concurred with the final ranking of the firms.

The HDR team was ranked first because the Committee viewed it as the firm most qualified to provide the scope of work outlined in the RFQ. The quality of its response was viewed as superior. The firm was well prepared for the interview and demonstrated energy and excitement about the job, the best understanding of the project and project goals and the ability to think outside the box. The experience of the team, including the project lead, as confirmed by reference checks, was determined to be exceptional. In addition to its extensive transportation expertise, the HDR team demonstrated its capacity to re-examine the development plan in light of current economic factors and to determine project feasibility and sustainability, and advance public-private partnerships in the overall design of the project. The team also has collaborated on similar assignments. Its retail economic sub-consultant received very favorable reviews. The firm also presented models of three design concepts for the terminal/parking facility, each one focusing on the City's history and future. Incorporated into the design a digital sign on the Main Street façade facing the interstate highway.

The IBI Group was ranked second. IBI demonstrated an understanding of the project and the historic significance of the terminal building. The proposed Project Designer in particular received very high reviews from the references checked and his level of detail. The team has the required experience on prior projects and mentioned the importance of linking Union Station with the Downtown. The IBI Group's design team received favorable reviews from the Committee; however there was some confusion on the substantial role that Tighe & Bond would play on a daily basis.

The Cambridge Seven Associates (C7A) was ranked third. C7A focused on the importance of the project being a catalyst for other urban renewal development in the neighborhood. The team showed examples of work on other transportation projects for the MBTA. The references evidenced

its planning and design experience including coordination with bus and train schedules during construction. The team revealed little in the area of specific ideas or a sense of understanding for the Union Station project, rather the focus was on work that the firm had done for other clients.

Overall, the Designer Selection Committee viewed the HDR team as the one best qualified to undertake the design of the Union Station project and recommends its selection.

Through this process we have all become excited and energized about the redevelopment of Union Station and we want to thank you for the opportunity to have served in this capacity.

Attachments: DSC Meeting Minutes

UNION STATION REGIONAL INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION CENTER

Designer Selection Committee

MEETING MINUTES

November 10, 2010

A meeting of the Union Station Designer Selection Committee was called to order by Christopher Moskal at 1:00p.m. at the City Hall Annex, 70 Tapley Street, Springfield, MA.

In attendance were:

Springfield Redevelopment Authority and Project Staff:

Christopher Moskal- Union Station-Project Manager
Maureen Hayes – Economic Development Consultant
Amanda Goncalves- Financial & Compliance Officer for SRA

Selection Committee Attendees:

Timothy Brennan- Executive Director, Pioneer Valley Planning Commission
Leslie Lawrence- Vice President of Commercial Lending, MassDevelopment
Jose Claudio- Director of Community & Relations Services, New North Citizens Council
Guy Bresnahan- MassDOT representative
Armando Feliciano- Chairman of the SRA Governing Board

Also present:

David Caldwell, Skanska Building USA, Inc.

INTRODUCTION:

- Brief introduction of committee members, SRA staff, as well as Mr. Dale Caldwell from Skanska.
- Ms. Hayes and Mr. Moskal reviewed the legal aspects and regulations and informed the members that all meetings of the committee would be posted and open to the public.
- Mr. Moskal reviewed the contents of the package that was distributed to each member, which included: the meeting agenda, the SRA Designer Selection Procedure and an organizational chart of each submitting team along with the evaluation criteria from the RFQ for notes by each member.
- Mr. Moskal informed the members on the need to appoint a Chair to the committee and at this time, on a motion by Ms. Leslie Lawrence and seconded by Mr. Jose Claudio, it was unanimously voted to name Mr. Guy Bresnahan as Chair of the Committee.

COMMITTEE RESPONSIBILITIES:

M. Hayes and C. Moskal provided an overview of the SRA Designer Selection Process (adopted September 13, 2010) as well as guidance provided by state and outside agencies including DCAM, the Designer Selection Board (DSB) and the Mass School Building Authority (MSBA).

The process is qualifications based. Information received from the Designer Selection Board (DSB) indicated that they do not score, all submittals are screened to make sure they meet the minimum requirements and based on DCAM evaluations, references and interviews on complex projects, three ranked finalists are recommended by polling individual members. A written recommendation is then sent to the State agency detailing the reasons for the ranking of the three finalists for design services.

DISCUSSION & EVALUATION OF PROPOSED FIRMS:

Four responses were received for the Union Station project and all met the minimum requirements set forth in the RFQ.

Discussion took place regarding the review of each submittal by the committee members and a question was asked if any of the submittals should be dismissed. In response the majority of members agreed that the submittal from Finegold Alexander did not meet the standard of the other three responses. Many of the members were not impressed stating that it was lacking in its presentation, and had no depth in their analysis of the project and potential enhancements along with a lack of creativity. Mr. Bresnahan voiced concern that after reading the submittal and referring to the evaluation criteria in the RFQ, he did not have adequate information to evaluate the Finegold Alexander team.

A motion was made by Ms. Lawrence and seconded by Mr. Brennan to dismiss the response from Finegold Alexander from further consideration. After a lengthy discussion by the committee members, it was voted to dismiss Finegold Alexander from further consideration with Mr. Bresnahan abstaining.

Mr. Bresnahan expressed his concerns that by knowing the total commitment by the key players and their subcontractors along with elaboration of past/prior projects it would allow for a more thorough evaluation of each firm on a more uniform basis, especially after the reference checks were completed. Many did not feel the same way and were basing their initial judgments on a more general overview of the firms' presentation, certifications, and presentations to the Springfield Redevelopment Authority.

The team discussed his concerns and came up with the following alternative:

- Each firm, will submit in writing the following information: "Using your Table of Organization provide the % of time for each team member for each of the six phases in the RFQ as soon as possible but no later than 3:00pm on Wednesday, November 17,2010." (Designer Services-Interview Letter)

The committee decided to extend the interviews to 60 minute presentations with a 30 minute follow-up for questions and answers.

Tim Brennan made a motion to interview the three remaining firms, Cambridge Seven Associates, Inc, IBI Group, and HDR Architecture, Inc. including the additional information requested of all interviewees; 2nd by Jose Claudio: The motion passed unanimously.

The committee members instructed the staff to send a letter informing the three unranked firms of the interview schedule and the additional information request.

Armando Feliciano made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 2:30 p.m; 2nd by Tim Brennan.

The next meeting is set for Friday, November 19, 2010 at 11:00 a.m. at the PVPC Conference Room.

Submitted by: Amanda Goncalves, Finance & Compliance Officer

**UNION STATION REGIONAL INTERMODAL
TRANSPORTATION CENTER**

Designer Selection Committee Meeting

MEETING NOTES

November 19, 2010

Mr. Guy Bresnahan, the Chair of the Designer Selection Committee, called the meeting to order at 11:00 a.m. The meeting was held at the Pioneer Valley Planning Commission conference room located at 60 Congress Street, Springfield, MA.

ATTENDANCE

Springfield Redevelopment Authority and Project Staff:

Christopher Moskal- Union Station- Project Manager
Maureen Hayes- Economic Development Consultant
Amanda Goncalves- Finance & Compliance Officer for SRA

Designer Selection Committee:

Timothy Brennan- Executive Director, Pioneer Valley Planning Commission
Leslie Lawrence- Director of Lending, Western Mass. Enterprise Fund
Jose Claudio- Director of Community & Relations Services, New North Citizens Council
Guy Bresnahan- MassDOT representative and Chair of the Committee
Armando Feliciano- Chairman of the SRA Governing Board

Also in attendance:

David Caldwell; Skanska Building USA, Inc.
Paul Kneedler; Skanska Building USA, Inc.
Steve Eustis; Skanska Building USA, Inc.

The attendance lists from each of the unranked finalists is attached and made part of these minutes.

INTRODUCTION

The Chair welcomed everyone and reminded all that the meeting has been posted and is open to the public.

Mr. Moskal reviewed the contents of the file provided to each of the members, staff and proposed OPM. They included the agenda for the November 19th meeting of the DSC, November 10th DSC meeting minutes, the interview questions, a copy of the SRA Designer Selection Procedures, an organizational chart from each of the unranked finalists, a list of suggested reference check questions provided by the Commonwealth's Designer Selection Board, and an evaluation criteria matrix from the RFQ.

Each member also received a summary prepared by the Chair of information from each unranked finalist pertaining to the breakdown of the percentage of time per person per phase. A copy is attached and made part of these minutes.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

After a review of the minutes by the members and an amendment offered by Mr. Moskal, the Chair entertained a motion to approve the minutes. On a motion by Mr. Claudio and seconded by Mr. Brennan, the minutes of the November 10, 2010 meeting were unanimously approved as amended.

INTERVIEW PROCESS:

Interviews were scheduled with three unranked finalists. The Chair reviewed the format stating that each of the unranked finalists would be provided 60-minutes to make their presentation and a follow-up 30-minute question and answer period.

During the Q&A period the finalists were asked a variety of questions, with the primary focus on the following:

1. List in order of importance the four main challenges you see in our project, and explain how you would propose to address them.
2. How will work be coordinated among team members? What is the team's prior experience working together?
3. Who is the most important person on your team and why?
4. Why should we choose your team?

SUMMARY OF PRESENTATIONS:

11:00 am- 12:30 pm Cambridge Seven Associates, Inc.

- Has a lot of experience working with MBTA and transit related projects.
- Brought some good ideas with regard to improvements to the prior design plan (e.g. larger interior corridors, the presence of natural light, bus facilities that allow for new energy efficient vehicles).
- Cambridge Seven Associates assessment of the structure of the current terminal building found it to be in great shape with no cracking or missing mortar joints.
- Their designs have become catalysts to other urban renewal development around them.
- Each of the design examples described by Cambridge Seven Associates focused on the creation of public spaces and the introduction of art.
- They informed the committee that they have added Epsilon to their team for NEPA permitting.
- Cambridge Seven Associates indicated that they have experience with the coordination of bus and train schedules during the construction period of various transportation center projects that they have worked on.

1:00 pm- 2:30 pm IBI Group, Inc

- Expressed corporate integration of various IBI offices in Boston, New York and Toronto to present the most skillful team for the project.
- Utilization of Tighe & Bond in Westfield for daily construction presence on the project and as a conference connection and local meeting office with the IBI team.
- Emphasized their mission of "Sustainable Design" and described ideas used on their work in North America. (e.g. Toronto Union Station)
- IBI Group felt that the redevelopment design must link the station with the rest of Downtown. (e.g., creation of trackside restaurant/retail to visually show the assets of Downtown)
- The IBI Team highlighted an extensive list of transportation center projects, historic preservation and the unique design aspects of each.

3:00 pm- 4:30 pm HDR Architectures, Inc.

- HDR emphasized the importance of updating the 2008 plan including an economic, and budgetary assessment and re-analyzing all of the design elements of the prior plan. Project viability, physical and financial, are critical to ensuring long term success.
- Introduced three new ideas and designs for the bus terminal/parking facility each one focusing on the City's history and future. Incorporated into the design a digital sign on the Main Street façade facing the interstate highway. A model and PowerPoint of each design was presented.
- The HDR presentation focused on the team's approach to design a 1st class project linking the City's rich past to the future and connecting the facility to the Central Business District. The team brought in examples of other projects to emphasize their approach and experience in designing intermodal transportation centers.
- The team emphasized sustainability and safety; SROI (Sustainable Return on Investment) & CPED (Crime Prevention through Environmental Design).

DISCUSSION & FOLLOW-UP:

Following the interviews, the committee members discussed the presentations and the committee was collectively impressed with HDR's presentation, their preparation and level of detail from the team members reviewing their initial thoughts and design for the Union Station project. The other unranked finalists focused, for the most part, on their experience with other projects and did little to relate this to specific thoughts and enhancements for the Union Station project. The members instructed the staff to proceed with reference checks, evaluations and other due diligence.

A motion was made by Mr. Feliciano and seconded by Mr. Claudio to direct the SRA staff to perform reference checks, and appropriate due diligence on the three unranked firms. The motion was unanimously approved.

The next Designer Selection Committee meeting was set for Monday, November 29th at 3:00p.m. at the PVPC Conference Room.

On a motion by Mr. Feliciano and seconded by Mr. Claudio, the meeting was adjourned at 5:10p.m.

Respectfully submitted

Amanda Goncalves
SRA Finance and Compliance Officer

Attachments: Attendance Lists of Each Unranked Finalist
Summary table of each firm's breakdown of time per person/per phase

Springfield Redevelopment Authority

Meeting Date:

November 19, 2010

Meeting Location: Pioneer Valley Planning Commission_Conference Rm

Description:

Interviews for Designer Services

Meeting Started:

11:00 a.m.- 12:30 p.m.

[illegible]

**Springfield Redevelopment Authority
Union Station Regional Intermodal Transportation Center**

Meeting Date: November 19, 2010

Meeting Location: Pioneer Valley Planning Commission_Conference Rm

Description: Interviews for Designer Services

Meeting Started: 1:00 p.m - 2:30 p.m

Attendees	Company
Anna Bonnett	IBI Group- Boston
Ritesh K. Warade	IBI Group- Boston
William Singer	IBI Group- NY
Don Loucks	IBI Group- Toronto CA
Peter Samton	IBI Group- NY
Darko Hreijanovic	IBI Group- NY
Dana Huff	Tighe & Bond

Springfield Redevelopment Authority Union Station Regional Intermodal Transportation Center

Meeting Date: November 19, 2010

Meeting Location: Pioneer Valley Planning Commission_Conference Rm

Description: Interviews for Designer Services

Meeting Started: 3:00 p.m - 4:30 p.m

Attendees	Company
Donald Warner	HDR Architecture, Inc
Scott Boyer	HDR Architecture, Inc
Tom Hess	HDR Architecture, Inc
Corina Horwitz	HDR Architecture, Inc
John Tarantino	HDR Architecture, Inc
Ron O'Brien	HDR Architecture/Engineering
Samuel Less	HDR Architecture/Engineering
Steve Montibello	Fitzmeyer & Toci
Jerome Yurkowski	Souza True & Partners
Robert Hodes	John Milner Architects
Kevin Nice	Arrowstreet
Luis Fernandez	Fernandez & Associates
Pamela Shadley	Shadley & Associates
Domingo Gonzalez	Domingo Gonzalez Associates
Arthur Stadig	Walker Parking Consultants
Steve Suprenaunt	HDR Architecture, Inc
Robert Bush	HDR Architecture/Engineering
Daniel Hodge	HDR Architecture/Engineering
Hemant Mehta	VJ Associates

Union Station FTE
Comparison of Design RFQ
Submittals

	Programming & Environmental Permitting	Schematic Design	Design Development	Construction Documents	Bidding, Negotiations & Contract Finalization	Construction Administration
HDR						
Total FTE positions by design phase	5.6	7.4	7.1	6.5	2.2	3
Prime Consultant	4.2	4.3	4.15	3.45	1.35	1.7
Sub Consultants	1.4	3.1	2.95	3.05	0.85	1.3
IBI Group						
Total FTE positions by design phase	4.79	7.06	8.93	6.68	2.4	1.96
Prime Consultant	1.78	3.25	4.37	2.9	1.37	0.6
Sub Consultants	3.01	3.81	4.56	3.78	1.03	1.36
Cambridge Seven Associates						
Total FTE positions by design phase	2	3.25	3.85	5.47	1.72	2.32
Prime Consultant	1.6	2.1	2.1	2.02	0.97	0.92
Sub Consultants	0.4	1.15	1.75	3.45	0.75	1.4

**UNION STATION REGIONAL INTERMODAL
TRANSPORTATION CENTER**

Designer Selection Committee Meeting
MEETING MINUTES
November 29, 2010

Mr. Guy Bresnahan, the Chair of the Designer Selection Committee, called the meeting to order at 3:06 p.m. The meeting was held at the Pioneer Valley Planning Commission conference room located at 60 Congress Street, Springfield, MA.

ATTENDANCE

Springfield Redevelopment Authority and Project Staff:

Christopher Moskal- Union Station- Project Manager
Maureen Hayes- Economic Development Consultant
Amanda Goncalves- Finance & Compliance Officer for SRA

Designer Selection Committee:

Timothy Brennan- Executive Director, Pioneer Valley Planning Commission
Leslie Lawrence- Director of Lending, Western Mass. Enterprise Fund
Jose Claudio- Director of Community & Relations Services, New North Citizens Council
Guy Bresnahan- MassDOT representative and Chair of the Committee

Also in attendance was Steve Eustis from Skanska Building USA, Inc.

INTRODUCTION

The Chair welcomed everyone and reminded all that the meeting has been posted and is open to the public.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

After a review of the minutes by the members, the minutes were amended. On a motion by Ms. Lawrence and seconded by Mr. Claudio, the minutes of the November 19, 2010 meeting were unanimously approved as amended.

REFERENCE CHECKS AND EVALUATIONS:

Mr. Moskal briefed the members on the process and sources utilized by staff and legal counsel for the purpose of checking each of the unranked finalists. The process included reference checks provided in the submittal, other public agencies including the Division of Capital Asset Management (DCAM) evaluations (as available), and other projects and information from the web. Mr. Moskal went on to present an overview of the materials on each of the finalists.

Cambridge Seven Associates, Inc. (C7A)

Reference checks:

- Worcester State College – Academic Center Renovation
 - C7A was instrumental in delivering the project during a time when the GC went bankrupt.
 - The Lead Architect was spoken very highly of. He went above and beyond the scope.
 - Building design was “spectacular” from a maintenance point of view using four colors to break up the different program spaces.
 - Would hire the firm with no hesitation. Rated a 10
- UMass – Champions Center, Central Heating Plant, Research Facility
 - The heating plant was a challenge from the “get go”. Way over budget.
 - Good design firm - in the top 5. Very responsive and easy to work with.
 - Rated the firm a 9 (10 being the highest)

DCAM Evaluations

- Westfield State University – New Athletic Facility
 - Designer successful in meeting college desire to maximize space.
 - Several requirements and standards were overlooked in the rush and were of a concern to the college. Overall good score (3.6 out of 4)
- UMass - Mullins Locker Expansion
 - The UMass Project Manager was not satisfied with performance during the design. The project representative was competent and professional during the construction phase.
 - Rating of 3.5 out of 4

IBI Group (Gruzen Samton/IBI Group)

Reference checks:

- New York Transit Authority – Time Square Shuttle
 - The lead designer, Darko Hreijanovic was excellent “like an artist”.
 - Managers assigned to the project were always fully involved.
 - The firm was rated between 8 and 10 overall.
 - Firm went beyond the scope, no issues, no problems excellent quality.
- * Other reference checks
 - Left messages for Ivan Lopez at the GSA / McCormack Courthouse Boston MA., Jamie Quinones from the GSA regarding the FBI master Planning and Garage in San Juan PR, and Don Liloia, Project Owner on the Port Imperial ferry Terminal in Weehawken, NJ.

DCAM evaluations – None available

HDR Architecture, Inc.

Reference Checks:

- MBTA Charles/MGH Red Line Improvements – Jaime Jackson, Dep. Dir of Planning

- The scope involved engineering services and was a \$35 million project.
 - The firm was very attentive to detail, very strong engineering and pushed the contractor along to stay on schedule. Tight budgeting controls.
 - Firm has an overall rating of 9 out of 10.
- New York Transit Authority – 53rd and Lexington Street Station Shirley Moy
 - \$60 million project.
 - Scope included ADA upgrades and redesign of the station.
 - Completed on time in 2005
 - Strong in structural and technical aspects of the project.
 - Phasing was integral part of the project.
 - The firm was rated 9 to 9.5 out of 10.
 - PVPC – Knowledge Corridor Study Dana Roscoe
 - Very detailed oriented.
 - Successful in grant applications and funding (leading to a grant of \$70 million)
 - Scope of the project included and evaluation and feasibility of passenger rail, infrastructure assessment, passenger rail forecasting, and a benefit cost analysis.
 - The firm was rated 8.5 to 9 out of ten.

DCAM Evaluations – None available

Mr. Moskal provided the members with an overview of the due diligence report from Attorney Barry. In short, he did not find anything that, in his view should cause the selection committee to prefer one firm over another. A copy of his e-mail dated November 22, 2010 is attached and made part of the minutes.

DISCUSSION & NEXT STEPS:

A discussion took place among the members with their overall impressions and thoughts on the materials of each of the finalists. The discussion mainly revolved around HDR Architecture, Inc., and was based on their enthusiasm and unmatched strength in their presentation, as compared to the other firms.

Mr. Bresnahan- Was not concerned by anything that had been presented during Mr. Moskal's presentation of the reference checks and that his perspective and opinion has not changed.

Ms. Lawrence- Liked the feedback on the recommendations regarding tight budgeting, strength in phasing and an overall positive rankings of the firm.

Mr. Brennan- Felt that the HDR team clearly demonstrated its desire, hungry for the job, was very well organized, and presented a lot of passion and ideas with regard to the success of Union Station project.

Mr. Claudio- Strongly believes that HDR is the best firm for the job, very impressed by the interview and the reference checks and nothing swayed his opinion based on the information presented.

Mr. Eustis (proposed OPM) - Impressed that HDR was the only presenter to focus heavily on Union Station, and not themselves, they were energetic, passionate and well prepared.

On a motion by Mr. Brennan and seconded by Mr. Claudio it was unanimously voted to poll each member on the ranking of each of the finalists.

Results of the polling are as follows:

<u>Brennan</u>	<u>Claudio</u>	<u>Lawrence</u>	<u>Bresnahan</u>
HDR	HDR	HDR	HDR
IBI, Group	IBI, Group	IBI, Group	IBI, Group
C7A	C7A	C7A	C7A

Even though Mr. Feliciano was not present at the meeting, he had informally indicated to Mr. Claudio that his recommended ranking was HDR, IBI Group, and C7A.

A motion was made by Mr. Brennan and seconded by Ms. Lawrence that a recommendation be drafted and forwarded to the SRA Governing Board indicating the ranking of design firms as 1). HDR Architecture, Inc. 2). IBI Group and 3). Cambridge Seven Associates, Inc. the vote was unanimous.

On a motion by Mr. Brennan and seconded by Mr. Claudio, the meeting was adjourned at 3:50p.m.

Respectfully submitted

Amanda Goncalves
SRA Finance and Compliance Officer

C: Attorney Peter Barry e-mail dated November 22, 2010 Re: Due Diligence

Moskal, Christopher

From: Barry, Peter [pbarry@bulkley.com]
Sent: Monday, November 22, 2010 3:53 PM
To: Moskal, Christopher; Goncalves, Amanda
Subject: Union Station - Due Diligence

Chris and Amanda:

As you know, at your request we did an internet search relative to the four firms submitting responses to the SRA's Request for Qualifications, Designer Services. The purpose of the search was to find whether there was any information in the public domain that would reflect adversely and significantly on the firms' ability and suitability. The focus of the search was on pending litigation, although we also looked at other information. The results are summarized below. In short, we did not find anything that, in our view, should cause the review committee to prefer one firm over another.

- Cambridge Seven - Nothing significant although the firm is a defendant in litigation arising out of a personal injury alleged to have been negligently caused by the design or installation of structural steel at a Massachusetts General Hospital project.
- HDR - Nothing significant although the firm is a defendant in more than fifteen (15) cases, including a fairly substantial case in Minnesota involving allegedly negligent equipment specifications.
- FA & A (NF&A) - Nothing significant although the firm is a defendant in a fairly substantial case in Ohio. On the positive side, the firm received good reviews for its work on the Fall River courthouse.
- IBI - No significant litigation and, because of Canadian financial disclosure requirements, detailed positive financial information.

If you need anything further, or wish to discuss this matter in greater detail, please call me.

Thanks,

Peter

Peter H. Barry, Esq.
Bulkley, Richardson and Gelinas, LLP
1500 Main Street, Suite 2700
Springfield, MA 01115
(413) 272-6316/Fax 413-747-0770
pbarry@bulkley.com

To comply with U.S. Treasury regulations, we inform you that any tax advice contained in this e-mail, including attachments, unless expressly stated otherwise, is not intended or written to be used, and cannot be used, for the purpose of (i) avoiding tax-related penalties under the Internal Revenue Code or

12/1/2010

(ii) promoting, marketing or recommending to another party any tax-related matter(s) addressed herein.

This e-mail communication, including all attachments to it, contains information from the law firm of Bulkley, Richardson and Gelinas, LLP that may be confidential and privileged. This information is intended only for the use of the listed recipient(s). If you are not an intended recipient, you may not review, copy, or distribute this message or any attachment thereto. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the sender immediately by e-mail and delete the original message.
